



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,605	02/19/2002	Jun Fujimoto	401578	2306
23548	7590	04/09/2007	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD			SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A	
700 THIRTEENTH ST. NW				
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3960			3653	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/09/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/076,605	FUJIMOTO, JUN
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey A. Shapiro	3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 4-6,8-11,14,45,46 and 49-53 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 4-6, 8-11, 14, 45, 46 and 49-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/18/07 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 49, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The term "person" in Claims 49, 52 and 53 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "person" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicant's Representative states in the response of 1/18/07 at p. 10, lines 2-7 that the phrase "transportable by a person" limits the claim by requiring that only a single person be able to lift the portable safe. However, if a small person were to lift the safe, the safe would have to be very small. If the person were very large, the acceptable safe size

Art Unit: 3653

would be larger. Also, persons of the same size might still have varying capabilities of what they can carry regarding weight. Where some people are capable of lifting 300 pounds, others are limited to five or ten pounds due to muscle tone, etc. Because the person is not defined specifically, it is not possible to be certain what the size or weight of the safe should be. Additionally, the weight of the safe changes depending upon if it is completely filled or completely empty, or somewhere in between these extremes. Therefore, the scope of the claims is not adequately communicated thus not placing the public on notice of when the claims are infringed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-6, 9-11, 49-51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al (US 5,615,625) in view of Dobbins (US 2002/0063034A1) and further in view of Blad et al (US 2002/0063035 A1).

As described in Claims 49 and 53, Cassidy discloses a portable safe (20), a docking station (18) and a depot station (12), remote from said docking station, in which banknotes or checks are feed to or from said safe. Note that said safe is able to be transported by a single person depending upon the strength required to lift it.

Said safe transfers information by RF interface (90) to a monitoring station, which can be construed as a currency control device. Said safe also transfers information using smartbox interface (106).

Regarding Claims 4-6, 9-11, 49 and 50, Cassidy further discloses an anomaly detection device in the form of an electronic monitoring system within said safe (20) that obtains data from various sensors, such as optical sensors (56, 58 or 60) which detects if a sliding door or lid is open. The wall of the container has a foil conduction sensor (62) that detects destructive compromising of the safe walls, such as by drilling. Battery level, temperature and humidity sensors (66, 68 and 70) are also included.

Cassidy also discloses a level sensor (82) which detects orientation of the safe. RF interface (90) communicates anomaly detection to the remote monitoring station. A connection anomaly is detected if the time the safe is not connected to a depot or deposit station exceeds a predetermined limit. See col. 5, lines 19-23.

Regarding position, the safe contains a GPS receiver which transmits its position to the monitoring station. See col. 5, lines 63-67.

Regarding Claims 49 and 51, Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Dobbins discloses use of a wirelessly networked safe system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated wireless networking, as taught by Dobbins, in Cassidy's portable safe system with deposit, depot and monitoring stations.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to reduce setup required as well as decrease the wiring required as well as costs. A wireless system is also well-known to

provide greater flexibility, as evidenced by the incorporation of access by handheld devices (140) to the system. See Dobbins, paragraphs 20 and 21. This motivation and teaching provided by Dobbins as well as Cassidy's RF interface (90) and remote paging system, would have led one ordinarily skilled in the art to have incorporated wireless communications technology throughout Cassidy's system.

Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Blad discloses using cassette systems with a gaming system as well as vending or "similar currency accepting machine[s]". See Blad, paragraph 19.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used Cassidy's cassette and docking system in a gaming environment, with the depot and deposit stations being game-related machines.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that gaming machines are functional equivalents to vending machines or ATM's in that they all concern currency handling. One ordinarily skilled in the art would have therefore found it obvious to use Cassidy's cassette and docking system in a gaming environment, as evidenced by Blad at paragraph 19.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al (US 5,615,625) in view of Dobbins (US 2002/0063034A1) and further in view of Blad et al (US 2002/0063035 A1) and further in view of Kenyon (US 4,819,866).

Cassidy discloses the currency handling system described above.

Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Kenyon discloses a currency holding machine that is protected by impact sensors. See Kenyon, col. 9, lines 63-67.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated an impact sensor within Cassidy's portable cassette, as taught by Kenyon.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to improve the security of the cassette by detecting any shock or load indicative of an attempt to damage or gain entrance to the cassette. See again Kenyon, col. 9, lines 63-67.

9. Claims 14 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al (US 5,615,625) in view of Dobbins (US 2002/0063034A1) and further in view of Blad et al (US 2002/0063035 A1) and further still further in view of Jones et al (US 5,623,637).

Cassidy discloses the system described above. Cassidy further discloses a code which is unique, generated when the safe is loaded, and then transmitted to the depot station from the deposit station, the code being entered by the operator at the computer at the depot station in order to unlock the safe. See col. 4, lines 3-16. Cassidy further discloses use of a unique code placed on an identity device (52) which is connected to plug (54) that is inserted into socket (52), thus allowing approved personnel to take possession of the safe. Agreement of the operator's code with the code in memory of the cassette and that code in the memory of the docking system is required in order for operator access to be granted.

Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Jones discloses using an operator smart card operator which has an operator identity code/password disposed on a card (250), which upon the event of entering the password, the card logic unit (220) generates a random number (303). This random number is also sent to a host and to the smart card processor (260) which combines the random number with the password to create a new number. See Jones, col. 8, lines 3-41.

Both Cassidy and Jones are considered analogous art because Cassidy concerns a secure computer-based cassette system for transport of currency and Jones concerns secure access to data on a computer-based system.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a card access system such as a PCMCIA-based smart card system to selectively provide an operator with access to Cassidy's portable cassettes, as taught by Jones, for the purpose of securing data and access in a computer-based system.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to secure the currency handling system when the identification device is lost or stolen as well as to selectively limit access to cassettes. See Jones, col. 1, line 60-col. 2, line 9.

10. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al (US 5,615,625) in view of Dobbins (US 2002/0063034A1) and further in view of Blad et al (US 2002/0063035 A1) and still further in view of Wells (US 5,330,185).

Cassidy discloses the system described above.

Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Wells discloses a gaming card vending machine (see figure 1) having card dispensing port (25, 27, 29, 33, 35 and 37), payment means (41) allowing payment by bills, coins or credit.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replaced Cassidy's ATMs with game card vending machines having game card dispensing ports.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to manage distribution of currency to and from various cash transaction systems, as taught by Blad at paragraph 19.

Official notice is taken that Wells' gaming card vending machine would have had a currency discriminator and a currency cassette since it is well-known to handle currency using a discriminator to validate currency according to its genuineness and to store currency in a storage area after discrimination.

11. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassidy et al (US 5,615,625) in view of Dobbins (US 2002/0063034A1) and further in view of Blad et al (US 2002/0063035 A1), further in view of Jones et al (US 5,623,637) and still further in view of Wells (US 5,330,185).

Cassidy discloses the system described above.

Cassidy does not expressly disclose, but Wells discloses a gaming card vending machine (see figure 1) having card dispensing port (25, 27, 29, 33, 35 and 37), payment means (41) allowing payment by bills, coins or credit.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replaced Cassidy's ATMs with game card vending machines having game card dispensing ports.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to manage distribution of currency to and from various cash transaction systems, as taught by Blad at paragraph 19.

Official notice is taken that Wells' gaming card vending machine would have had a currency discriminator and a currency cassette since it is well-known to handle currency using a discriminator to validate currency according to its genuineness and to store currency in a storage area after discrimination.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 4-6, 8-11, 14, 45, 46 and 49-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAS



April 1, 2007



PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600